



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

The long-expected edition of *Bacchylides* was received at the office of the Journal from the authorities of the *British Museum* after the present number had been made up, and there is no space for a full account of this priceless addition to the Golden Treasury of Greek Lyric Poetry. The editor is the distinguished scholar F. G. KENYON, whose mastery was evinced by his *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* and his *Herondas*, and there is no one who will begrudge him the privilege of another *editio princeps*. This time Mr. KENYON'S rare palaeographic ability was not put to so severe a test and he has had the advantage of help and counsel from eminent Hellenists, from JEBB, with his faultless taste and his unique faculty for Greek verse-composition, from the lamented PALMER, from BLASS, the skilled palaeographer, from SANDYS, with his wide command of the whole Greek domain. But it is Mr. KENYON'S edition after all, and to him the gratitude of scholars is first due. Twenty poems, some of them entire, have been brought to light and a new chapter in the history of Greek literature has to be written. Before many days the philological world will be flooded with literature on the subject, with emendations, restorations, characteristics. The happy hours of the first possession will be succeeded by weeks muggy with extemporized learning—extemporized, for comparatively few are the scholars who have earned the right to speak authoritatively by reason of special studies in this too much neglected domain of Greek poetry; and in the dense air which is about to envelop Bacchylides, the memory of these three or four undisturbed days will come back with the sigh, *fulsere vere candidi tibi soles*. True, every one knew in advance from the old fragments what manner of poet we were to expect; no οἰόθρων πέτρα like Aischylos, no τανύπτερος αἰετός like the Theban singer, but a clear and fluent and brilliant master of his art, one who well deserves the title by which he calls himself in one of his Hieronic odes, 'a honey-tongued Keian nightingale.' Still, Bacchylides has given us much more than we could have dreamed of, combinations that no one could have anticipated, dramatic effects which theorists had denied to lyric poetry, and, like Cortes' men, scholars are looking at each other with a wild surmise. But amid all the joy over the new treasure and the endeavor to master the new points of view, the lover of Pindar may be pardoned for thinking chiefly of the important accession to the Pindaric apparatus that has come to us through the discovery of Bacchylides. Here he welcomes confirmation of previous judgments, there he yields with what grace he may to the contravention of cherished views. Fourteen of the poems are epinikian odes, and enough of these are sufficiently well preserved to show that they are built on the same lines as those of Pindar's Songs of Victory. The type is older than Pindar. It is in the handling of the type that the differences come out. Praise, myth, praise are found as in Pindar, and those who believe with Drachmann that the myths

are mere *ἐμβλήματα* will doubtless point to Bacchylides with triumph. But others will maintain that Pindar has put a deeper meaning into the conventional adornment, and that Bacchylides was satisfied with the mere embellishment, and has given us a Euripidean as over against an Aischylean choral. Those who have made so much of recurrent words in Pindar will find that Bacchylides lends scarcely any handle to repetition as a *τεθμός* of lyric poetry, as an indication of the various members of the Terpanthian *νόμος*. No such toying iteration is to be found in Bacchylides as we have, for instance, in Pindar's Sixth Olympian, and those who are not willing to concede that Pindar, like other strong natures such as Samson and Aias, delighted in the play on words, will have to set up the theory that Bacchylides deliberately abandoned the technique of repetition and paronomasia just as alliteration was abandoned in English poetry. The short line which reigned in the days before Boeckh will probably be brought to honor again by this MS of Bacchylides, but to those who are familiar with the principles of kolometry the short line is merely a matter of convenience to the eye. Those who have learned to recognize the importance of the literary sphere for syntax and of syntax for the literary sphere will be interested to find that different as Pindar and Bacchylides are in race, in gifts, in temperament, the lyric law keeps them to the same range. One has not much new syntax to learn in passing from Pindar to Bacchylides.

But while the lover of Pindar may be prone to dwell on the resemblances and differences of the two rival poets, the student of Greek literature in general will be most interested in the "lyrical idylls," as the editor calls them. One of them tells of the demand for the surrender of Helen, another of Deianeira's gift to Herakles, yet another and a most spirited poem of the contest between Minos and Theseus, in which Theseus trusts himself to his father Poseidon with all the unreserve of the divers in the Bay of Naples. Most remarkable of all is a lyrical dialogue between Aigeus, king of Athens, and Medeia, his queen, which not only increases our repertory by a fine poem, but constitutes, as Mr. KENYON says, "a striking and, in some respects, unique addition to our knowledge of Greek lyrical composition."

Some of the poems are much mutilated and tempt the restoring hand. Would that a thorough study of the odes that remain entire might precede the ready fancy of the multitudinous guessers! But the wish is vain. As I lay down my pen I catch sight of strings of unconvincing restorations and, which is worse, hear a critic's voice declaring Pindar a landlubber and Bacchylides a seasoned sailor. It is true that Pindar's fellow-Boeotian, Hesiod, was a landlubber *οὔτε τι ναυτιλίας σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν* (O. et D. 649), but even he had to make space for navigation, because his brother Perses might take to the sea. "The Boeotians," says Mr. Roberts the apologist, "never made use of the sea, favourably situated as they were, to the same extent as the Dutchmen,"¹ with whom he parallels them; but for all that the land that had been the abode of the Minyan vikings, that headed the catalogue of the ships in Homer, that had Aulis for a harbor, can hardly be classed as the home of the landlubber, and I may not have blundered so much after all in calling attention to the sea-air in Pindar.²

¹ The Ancient Boeotians, p. 59.

² Introd. Essay, xliii.

Mr. BUSSELL has written a book entitled *The School of Plato* (London, Methuen; New York, Macmillan), which is readable in spite of its preciosity and suggestive in spite of its oracular tone. The late Mr. Pater is his cynosure, which will hardly be an unqualified recommendation in the eyes of some people, and Mr. BUSSELL has taken that alembicated stylist's *Plato and Platonism* more seriously than a philologist would be apt to do. Paired with this admiration of Mr. Pater's powers, one finds a curious neglect of a somewhat more conspicuous thinker, and it is with no little astonishment that one reads the candid confession that the author "did not read Lotze's *Microcosm* until the greater part of the work was in the press." One might forgive Mr. Bussell for calling a hen 'the solicitous stepmother of the farmyard,' but Lotze was a philologist as well as a philosopher: he was the translator of *Antigone* into Latin verse as well as the author of the *Mikrocosmos*, and an editor of a *Journal of Philology*—especially one who knew Lotze in the flesh—cannot help taking the matter to heart. But really the work hardly enters into the range of this periodical, for, when Mr. Bussell says that he is afraid that his title will appear somewhat of a misnomer, his fear is fully justified. The aim of the work is to prepare the way for an elaborate defence of the Roman Imperial Age—that age which, as Mommsen has said, is "mehr geschmäht als gekannt"—and Sokrates and Plato together occupy only 40 pages out of a total of 346.

Mr. G. F. HILL, in his *Sources of Greek History between the Persian and Peloponnesian War* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press)—a collection of documents for the period known as the πεντηκονταετία—has primarily had in view an educational object. The student of history is to be taught to study it in the light of ancient authorities, not in the reflections of modern writers. Such a lesson, it is superfluous to say, is not needed by the readers of this Journal. But the secondary object is not less praiseworthy, and many advanced students will be glad to be spared the necessity of referring to the originals for the verification of the references in such a book as Busolt's *Pentekontaetie*. Of course, as in the case of punctuation, any arrangement is *ipso facto* an interpretation, and an excerpt cannot take the place of an unbroken context; but every such work has its limitations. The book is divided into the following chapters: I. Origin and Organization of the Athenian Confederacy; II. The Quota Lists; III. External History of Athens, her Allies and Colonies; IV. The Athenian City; V. The Athenian Constitution; VI. Biographical; VII. Sparta and Peloponnesus; VIII. The Western Greeks. There is also a list of Athenian archons, but, except here and in the quota lists, dates are a rarity, belonging, presumably, to the reflections of modern writers.